



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/800,448	03/05/2001	Santu Bandyopadhyay	A34065	2808

21003 7590 04/23/2003

BAKER & BOTTS  
30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA  
NEW YORK, NY 10112

EXAMINER

EWOLDT, GERALD R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1644

DATE MAILED: 04/23/2003

7

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.  
09/800,448

Applicant(s)  
Bandyopadhyay et al.

Examiner  
G.R. Ewoldt

Art Unit  
1644



-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Aug 12, 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 14-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 14-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some\* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_ 6) ☐ Other:

#### DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant's election of Group II, in Paper No. 6, filed 8/12/02 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)). Upon reconsideration, however, the restriction requirement is withdrawn.

2. Claims 14-27 are pending and being acted upon.

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 14-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Specifically:

A) The term "dendritic Langerhans type cells" is vague and indefinite as the term is not defined in the specification. It is unclear just what separates a Langerhans' cell from a "dendritic Langerhans type cell". Accordingly, the metes and bounds of the claims cannot be established.

B) The term "phylogenetically close species" is vague and indefinite as the term is not defined in the specification. It is unclear which species would be considered "phylogenetically close", and which would not. For example, it is clear that the Inventors consider mice and rats to be "phylogenetically close", but it is unclear whether species such as mice and guinea pigs, or mice and rabbits, or mice and beavers, would also be considered close. Accordingly, the metes and bounds of the claims cannot be established.

5. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

6. Claims 14-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described

in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

The specification disclosure is insufficient to enable one skilled in the art to practice the invention as claimed without an undue amount of experimentation. Undue experimentation must be considered in light of factors including: the breadth of the claims, the nature of the invention, the state of the prior art, the level of one of ordinary skill in the art, the level of predictability of the art, the amount of direction provided by the inventor, the existence of working examples, and the quantity of experimentation needed to make or use the invention.

The method of the instant claims comprises a "method for producing dendritic Langerhans type cells" by culturing PBMCs with platelets. It is well-known in the art that Langerhans cells are a type of immature dendritic cells (DCs) found in tissue (Steinman, *Fundamental Immunology*, Paul, ed. 1999). Said immature DCs are known to be both morphologically and histochemically distinct from mature DCs, i.e., the cell types look different and they express different cell surface markers. In particular, Langerhans' cells are identified by visible Birbeck granules, their expression of CD1a, and low level expression of MHC Class II (Williams et al., 1994). Additional differences between mature and immature DCs include high levels of expression of CD80, CD83, CD86, as well as MHC Class II on mature DCs (but not on immature DCs) whereas CD1a expression disappears (Caux et al., 1996). CD40 expression is also high on mature DCs but not on immature DCs (Steinman, *Fundamental Immunology*, Paul, ed. 1999).

The specification discloses at page 8 that the cells produced by the methods of the instant claims show high expression of HLA-DR (MHC Class II), CD40, and CD86, as well as low expression of CD1a. This marker expression pattern would indicate that the method of the instant claims results in the production of mature DCs and not immature (Langerhans') DCs. However, the specification also discloses that the cells produced by the methods of the instant claims show low expression of CD80 and CD83, which would not be indicative of mature DCs. Given this disclosure, it is unclear just what type of cells the method of the instant claims result in; it is clear however that the products are not Langerhans' cells. Accordingly, the claimed method is considered to be highly unpredictable and requiring of undue experimentation to practice as claimed.

*In re Wands*, 858 F.2d at 737, 8 USPQ2d at 1404 (Fed. Cir. 1988) indicates that the more unpredictable an area is, the more specific enablement is necessary in order to satisfy the statute. Thus, in view of the quantity of experimentation necessary, the lack of sufficient working examples, i.e., a method that results in the production of Langerhans' cells, and the lack of sufficient guidance in the specification, it would take undue trials and errors to practice the claimed invention.

7. No claim is allowed.

8. A paper submitted June 04, 2002 indicates that an IDS has been submitted. However, no Form-1449 nor any references have been received.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dr. Gerald Ewoldt whose telephone number is (703) 308-9805. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Thursday from 7:30 am to 5:30 pm. A message may be left on the examiner's voice mail service. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christina Chan can be reached on (703) 308-3973. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Technology Center 1600 receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

Papers related to this application may be submitted to Technology Center 1600 by facsimile transmission. Papers should be faxed to Technology Center 1600 via the PTO Fax Center located in Crystal Mall 1. The faxing of such papers must conform with the notice published in the Official Gazette, 1096 OG 30 (November 15, 1989). The CM1 Fax Center telephone numbers are 703-872-9306 (before final) and 703-872-9307 (after final).



G.R. Ewoldt, Ph.D.  
Primary Examiner  
Technology Center 1600  
April 22, 2003